



PATENT APPEAL REPLY BRIEF
Application No. 10/797,857
Examiner: Paul Kim
Art Unit: 2161
Applicant: Fordham

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(LHTG No. 00,1247-A)

In re Application of: **Matthew A. Fordham**)
)
)
Serial No. **10/797,857**) Examiner: **Paul Kim**
)
)
Filed: **March 10, 2004**) Group Art Unit: **2161**
)
)
For: **METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR**) Conformation No. **3724**
)
)
)
CREATING VERTICAL SEARCH)
)
ENGINES)

Mail Stop: Appeal
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

PATENT APPEAL REPLY BRIEF

37 C.F.R. §41.41

Stephen Lesavich, PhD

Lesavich High-Tech Law Group, P.C.
39 S. LaSalle Street, Suite 325
Chicago, IL 60663

Table of Contents

REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANT	3
REAL PARTY IN INTEREST	3
RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES	3
STATUS OF CLAIMS	4
STATUS OF AMENDMENTS	4
SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER	5
GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL	6
ARGUMENT.....	7
ARGUMENT FOR REJECTION 1	7
CONCLUSION FOR REJECTION 1	9
ARGUMENT FOR REJECTION 2	10
CONCLUSION FOR REJECTION 2	13
CONCLUSION FOR REJECTION 3	16
ARGUMENT FOR REJECTION 4	17
CONCLUSION FOR REJECTION 4	17
CONCLUSION FOR ALL ISSUES	18
CLAIMS LISTING APPENDIX	19
EVIDENCE APPENDIX	30
RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX	31

REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANT

This is a Patent Appeal Reply Brief submitted under 37 C.F.R. §41.41 to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for the Examiner's Answer Mailed March 17, 2008. This Reply Brief is being filed within two months 37 C.F.R. §41.41(a)(1) or by May 17, 2008.

The Appellant traverses all of the Examiner's assertions in the Examiner's Answer. The Appellant may respond to selected assertions by the Examiner, but the Appellant intends to traverse all of the Examiner's assertions in the Examiner's Answer.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

Logika Corporation, 3717 North Ravenswood, Suite 243, Chicago, IL 60613
that Assignee of the present application, is the real-party in interest.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals and interferences known to the Appellant.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

The status of the claims is as follows:

1. Claims at filing: 1-25
2. Claims 14-22 canceled in a Preliminary Amendment filed March 10, 2004, and claims 26-27 added in an Amendment filed February 6, 2007.
3. Claims pending: 1-13 and 23-27.
4. Claims rejected: 1-13 and 23-27
5. Claims allowed: Claims 6-13 were deemed as allowable subject matter in the First Office action. The Examiner withdraw the allowable subject matter in the Final Office Action.

Thus, the claims on appeal are claims 1-13 and 23-37.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The amendments filed on March 10, 2004 and February 6, 2007, have been entered as understood by the Appellant.

The Appellant submits a new amendment and response dated May 16, 2008, herewith and a request to re-open prosecution with the Primary Examiner under 37 CFR 41.39(2)(b)(1). This amendment and response has not yet been considered.

SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The Appellant incorporates by reference the summary of claimed subject matter from the patent appeal brief filed October 27, 2007.

GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

1. The withdrawal of 35 U.S.C. §101 for rejected claims 1-13 and 23-27 leaves allowable subject matter in the application.
2. Whether Examiner Kim has correctly applied 35 U.S.C. §103 rejecting claims 1, 2, 4 and 23 as being unpatentable over Berstis (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,575, hereinafter referred to as BERSTIS) in view of Brady et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,430).
3. Whether Examiner Kim has correctly applied 35 U.S.C. §103 rejecting claims 3, 24 and 25 as being unpatentable over BERSTIS, in view of BRADY, and in further view of *Official Notice*.
4. Whether Examiner Kim has correctly applied 35 U.S.C. §103 rejecting Claim 5 as being unpatentable over BERSTIS, in view of BRADY, and in further view Sullivan et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,711).

ARGUMENT

ARGUMENT FOR REJECTION 1

The Examiner has now withdrawn the 35 USC §101 rejections for claims 1-13 and 23-27. (Examiner's Answer page 2).

In the First Office Action, the Examiner indicated Claims 6-13 included allowable subject matter. The Examiner indicated that Claims 6-13 were objected to as being dependent on a base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent format form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. (First Office Action, page 9).

In the First Response, the Appellant added two new claims, Claims 26 and 27. Claim 6 was dependent only on Claim 1. Claim 26 included all the dependencies of Claim 1 and Claim 6. Claim 27 included all the dependencies of Claims 1, 6 and 13. The Examiner deemed such claims were allowable. The Examiner made no other comments about these allowable claims.

In the Final Office Action, even though the Examiner had indicated the subject matter was allowable in Claims 6-13, the Examiner rejected Claims 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as been directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner also improperly withdrew his objections to the allowable subject matter in Claims 6-13 and instead instituted a new rejection of claims 6-13. (Final Office Action, Office Action Summary Page, Disposition of the Claims, boxes 6 and 7).

The Examiner asserted that "While claims 6-13 have been indicated as being allowable but objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, the

Examiner notes that in order for said claims to be allowable, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 must be overcome.”

The Examiner has now withdrawn the 35 USC §101 rejections for claims 1-13 and 23-27. Thus, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101 have been overcome.

Therefore, claims 6-13 and new claims 26 and 27 should now be immediately allowable.

The Examiner did not re-instate these claims in his Examiner’s Answer after withdrawing the §101 rejection. This leaves claims 6-13 and 26-27 in a procedurally ambiguous state under the patent rules.

The Appellant also submits that this §101 withdrawal without re-stating the allowable claims and the resulting ambiguity of their status represents a new ground of rejection for claims 6-13 and 26-27.

In addition, the Examiner did not make any further comments or include these allowable claims 6-13 or 26-27 in any of obviousness rejections under 103(a) in his Examiner’s Answer or previous office action. This also represents a new ground or rejection for claims 6-13 and 26-27, that is there is no pending rejections for these claims.

The Appellant includes an amendment herewith so the amended claims based on the allowable subject matter in Claim 6-13 can immediately passed to allowance. The Appellant asks the Supervisory Examiner to review and process the attached amendment.

CONCLUSION FOR REJECTION 1

Since the Examiner's Answer includes new ground of rejections and leaves allowable claims in procedural ambiguous state, the Appellant requests the Primary Examiner reopen prosecution under 41.39(2)(b)(1).

ARGUMENT FOR REJECTION 2

Independent Claims 1 and 23

The Examiner basically just cut and pasted his originally arguments into the Examiner's Answer. The Appellant traverses all of the new arguments made by the Examiner in Paragraph 10 of the Examiner's Answer.

The Examiner is reminded that to establish a case of *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested. *In re Royka* 400 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974).

The Examiner asserts that BERSTIS, in combination with BRADY, discloses all of the elements in Independent Claims 1 and 23.

However, the Examiner meticulously cited sections of BERSTIS and BRADY for all the elements of independent Claim 1, except for two claim elements. The Examiner did not find anywhere in BERSTIS or BRADY individually, or the combination thereof, at least two elements of independent Claim 1 including:

“verifying that entries in the plurality of second index files are appropriate for the selected subject; and

making a vortal accessible on another network device via the computer network for the selected subject using the final index.”

The Examiner repeats for a third time the same analysis and silence on where these two claim elements are taught or suggested by BERSTIS or BRADY.

The Examiner then asserts that “Brady teaches the verifying step only, with “such assignments can be reviewed by human operator for

reclassification” and this reads upon the verifying step of the claimed invention.

This another new grounds of rejection the Examiner has not raised before. This is also another new ground of rejection for which prosecution should be re-opened under 41.39(2)(b)(1) with the Primary Examiner.

However, the claimed invention is automatic and does not require a human operator for operation. As is clearly evidenced by the recited elements of Claim 1. In addition, the Appellant teaches this step is automatic in its application,

“plural entries in plural second index files are preferably processed automatically based on a pre-determined set of criteria. In such an embodiment, the URLs in the plural second index files are presented to a verification application program 54 on the vertical search engine server 30. The verification application program 54 makes decisions on the URL based on pre-determined criteria similar to those made by a human users.” (Application, page 29, lines 9-13).

Thus, the BRADY, by the Examiner’s own words, teaches away in a material aspect from the Appellant’s invention, namely, requiring human intervention for a verify step.

Since the prior art references do not teach all of the claim elements by the Examiners own words and analysis, the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness in violation of the holding of *In re Royka*.

BRADY does not teach, suggest or even mention vortals or vertical search engines, period. Enough said.

BERSTIS only mentions vortals and vertical searching in the Background section of the patent. Neither word is mentioned in the Claims,

Abstract, Summary of the Invention or Detailed description. Thus, BERSTIS is silent on how the BERSTIS invention, if at all, can be applied to vortals or vertical search engines. Thus, the Examiner must provided evidence for an inherency.

The Examiner is reminded again that “the fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or may be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic.” *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The inherency also may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient to establish inherency. *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

The Examiner is also reminded of the danger of trying to assert a reference teaches something when it is in fact silent on any such teaching. The Appellant’s attorney recently won a patent appeal before the Appeals Board when another Examiner in another matter asserted a reference taught a feature of the claimed invention because it mentioned a claimed feature but was actually silent on any actual details or teachings of the recited claim feature. The Examiner should review patent appeal decision 2007-3451, decided March 8, 2008.

Thus, Claims 1 and 23 are not obvious and the rejections of Claims 1 and 23 are improper. Therefore the rejection of Claims 1 and 23 must be immediately withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2 and 4

The arguments for independent Claims 1 and 23 are incorporated by reference. Claims 2 and 4 are dependent claims that add additional limitations not included in the corresponding independent claims. The Examiner is reminded that if an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, than any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Thus, Claims 2 and 4 are not obvious and the rejections of Claims 2 and 4 are improper. Therefore the rejection of Claims 2 and 4 must be immediately withdrawn.

CONCLUSION FOR REJECTION 2

Thus, Claims 1, 2, 4 and 23 are not obvious and the rejections of these claims are improper. Therefore the rejection of claims must be immediately withdrawn.

Since the Examiner's Answer included a new ground of rejection, the Appellant requests the Primary Examiner reopen prosecution under 41.39(2)(b)(1).

ARGUMENT FOR REJECTION 3

The Examiner **admitted** that BERTIS and BRADY differ from the claimed invention in that they fail to specifically disclose that the DNS for the Internet is included in the DNS for the network (claims 3 and 25). (First Office Action, Page 7) *The Applicant accepted this admission.* (First Response, pages 25)

The Examiner **admitted** that BERTIS and BRADY differ from the claimed invention in that they fail to specifically disclose that the opening of a .COM, .EDU, .GOV, .MIL, .NET or .ORG top-level domain name file (claim 24). (First Office Action, Page 7). *The Applicant accepts this admission.* (First Response, page 25).

The Examiner asserted the Applicant had inadequately traversed the taking of Official Notice. This is clearly an erroneous assertion by the Examiner. The Appellant repeats the arguments made above.

The Applicant traversed the assertion of Official Notice taken by the Examiner as follows.

The Examiner is reminded that there must be some form of evidence in the record to support an assertion of Official Notice. *In re Lee*, 277 F.3d at 1344-45 (Fed. Cir. 2002). The Examiner has not provided any such evidence other than to assert that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.”

The Applicant traverses this assertion of Official Notice as being defective and improper because: (1) the Examiner admitted that Neither Bertis nor Brady alone or in combination teach the claim limitations the Examiner took Official Notice of; (2) Claims 3, 24 and 25 are dependent claims addition the additional limitations to the corresponding independent claims that are not obvious in combination; (3) these dependent claims add additional limitations to the vertical search engine with the specific features claimed by the Applicant; (4) there were very few vertical search engines in existence period when the Applicant filed the original parent application in 2001 that the current divisional application is based on and there are still very few vertical search engines used at all on the Internet; (5) there were no vertical search engines with the claim elements of the combination of

the independent and dependent claims that the Applicant knew about at the time the application was filed.

Since the Applicant has adequately traversed the Examiner's assertion of Official Notice, the Examiner must provide documentary evidence of proof for the Office Notice with the rejected claim limitations used in a vertical search engine at the time the Applicant filed the application in the next Office action if the rejection is to be maintained. *In re Zurko*, 258 F.3d 1379, 1697(Fed. Cir. 2001). The Applicant respectfully requests such evidence. (First Response, Pages 26-29).

The Examiner asserts "The Applicant has inadequately traversed the Official Notice and is therefore deficient, no document evidence shall be provided by the Examiner. Accordingly, because of the Applicant's inadequate traversal, it is noted the rejections of claims 3 and 24-25 have been modified to indicate that the limitations of the claims, which are well-known in the art, are now taken to be as admitted prior art." (Final Office Action pages 13-14).

The Examiner repeats the same false assertions in the Examiner's Answer on page 10.

In addition, the Examiner asserts "the Official Notice facts are misplaced as the Official Notice was not directed to the obviousness of a Vertical Search Engine but the claimed features of claims 3, 24 and 24." (Examiner's Answer, Page 10).

The Appellant is perplexed by the Examiner's assertions. Does the Examiner not understand how dependent claims actually work? These three claims are dependent claims. Which mean they include all the limitations of their corresponding independent claim as well as the additional features recited.

Take for example dependent claim 3 which recites additional specific details of a DNS with .COM, EDU, etc. top-level domain name files. There is a claim element in the correspondence independent claim for "top level domain name files"

for vertical search engines. Dependent claim 3 adds more specific as to what these top level domain name files are and include .COM, .EDU, etc.

The Examiner assertions of Official Notice cannot operate in a vacuum and cannot ignore the dependencies of these dependent claims. In addition, the Examiner did not assert any other prior art that illustrated using the specific domain name files for vertical search engines as claimed in dependent claims.

Therefore, the Appellant has adequately traversed the Official Notice. The Official Notice facts asserted by the Examiner are not admitted prior art.

CONCLUSION FOR REJECTION 3

Thus, the rejections of Claims 3, 24 and 25 are improper. Therefore the rejection of Claims 3, 24 and 25 must be immediately withdrawn.

ARGUMENT FOR REJECTION 4

The Examiner **admitted** that BERSTIS and BRADY differ from the claimed invention in that they fail to specifically disclose the method of eliminating generic keywords and adding synonyms and modified spellings of keywords to the list (claim 5). *The Applicant accepted this admission.*

The Arguments for Claims 1 and 23 are incorporated by reference. Since the Applicant clearly explained by BERSTIS and BRADY were not obvious and the Examiner admitted that BERSTIS and BRADY did not teach the claim limitations of Claim 5, the combination of BERSTIS, BRADY and SULLIVAN cannot teach the limitations of Claim 5.

Claim 5 is a dependent claim that add additional limitations not included in the corresponding independent claims. The Examiner is reminded that if an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, than any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

CONCLUSION FOR REJECTION 4

Thus, the rejection of Claim 5 is improper. Therefore the rejection of Claim 5 must be immediately withdrawn.


CONCLUSION FOR ALL ISSUES

For the foregoing reasons, Appellant submits that all of the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-13 and 23-27 are clearly erroneous. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests that the Appeal Board reverse all of the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-13 and 23-27 and immediately pass all claims 1-13 and 23-27 to allowance.

Respectively submitted:

Lesavich High-Tech Law Group, P.C.

Date: May 16, 2008

By: 
Stephen Lesavich, PhD
Registration No. 43,749

CLAIMS LISTING APPENDIX

Claims 1-13 and 23-27.

1. **(Original)** A method for creating a vertical search engine, comprising:

receiving a list of a plurality of keywords to be used for the vertical search engine on a network device, wherein the list of keywords includes general and specific keywords for a selected subject;

processing the list of plurality of keywords to create a refined list of keywords, wherein the processing includes adding, subtracting or modifying automatically the list of plurality of keywords;

creating a plurality of first index files associated with a plurality of first data files by checking a plurality of domain names from a plurality of domain name files associated with a domain name system for a computer network, wherein the plurality of first index files include a plurality of pointers to the associated data files, and wherein the plurality of first data files include a plurality of entries including electronic information extracted from a plurality of web-sites associated with a plurality of active domain names from the plurality of domain name files;

creating a plurality of second index files with associated plurality of second data files by searching the plurality of first index files for keywords from the refined list of keywords, wherein the plurality of second index files include a plurality of pointers to the associated plurality of second data files, and wherein the plurality of second data files include a plurality of entries including electronic information extracted from a plurality of web-sites associated with the plurality of active domain

names for keywords from the refined list of keywords;

verifying that entries in the plurality of second index files are appropriate for the selected subject;

creating a final index from the plurality of entries first index; and

making a vortal accessible on another network device via the computer network for the selected subject using the final index.

2. **(Original)** The method of Claim 1 further comprising a computer readable medium having stored therein instructions for causing a processor to execute the steps of the method.

3. **(Original)** The method of Claim 1 wherein the domain name system for the computer network includes the Domain Name System for the Internet.

4. **(Original)** The method of Claim 1 wherein the plurality of entries including electronic information extracted from a plurality of web-sites associated with a plurality of active domain names from the plurality of domain name files include a title, description, a uniform resource locator, or a pre-determined amount of electronic content associated with a web-site associated with an active domain name.

5. **(Original)** The method of Claim 1 wherein the processing step includes:
eliminating keywords that are too generic or have multiple meanings;
modifying keywords by adding alternative spellings or additional words; and
adding automatically synonyms for keywords to the list of plurality of
keywords to create the refined list of keywords.

6. **(Original)** The method of Claim 1 wherein the step of creating a plurality
of first index files includes:

opening a plurality of top-level domain name files associated with the domain
name system for the computer network;

checking a plurality of domain names from the plurality of open top-level
domain name files to determine whether any of the plurality of domain names are
associated with an active web-site on the computer network;

extracting domain names in the plurality of open top-level domain name files
associated with active web-sites on the computer network;

storing the extracted domains names in a plurality of entries in a plurality of
separate files, thereby creating a plurality of separate files including the plurality of
entries; and

sorting each of the plurality of separate files based on a pre-determined
sorting scheme to create a plurality of sorted separate files.

7. **(Original)** The method of Claim 6 wherein the step of opening a plurality
of top-level domain name files associated with a domain name system including
opening a .COM, .EDU, .GOV, .MIL, .NET or .ORG top-level domain name file

associated with the Internet domain name system.

8. **(Original)** The method of Claim 6 wherein the checking step includes attempting to visit a web-site on the computer network with a software spider to determine whether the web-site is active.

9. **(Original)** The method of Claim 6 wherein the checking step includes extracting electronic content from an active web-site on the computer network.

10. **(Original)** The method of Claim 6 wherein the extracting step includes:

(a) adding a first individual character component to a first file based on the first character of an entry, when the first individual character component was derived from an entry in one of the plurality of open top-level domain name files;

(b) moving the first character of the first individual character component to an end of the first individual character component, thereby exposing a next character and creating a next individual character component;

(c) adding the next individual character component to a next file based on the next character of the first individual character component;

(d) moving the next character of the next individual character component to an end of the next individual character component, thereby exposing a (next character+1) and creating a (next character+1) individual character component;

(e) adding the (next character+1) individual character component to a (next character+1) file based on the (next character+1) of the (next character+1) individual character component;

(f) repeating steps (d) and (e) until first character of the first individual character component is reached.

11. **(Original)** The method of Claim 6 wherein the storing step includes storing the plurality of individual character components in a plurality of separate files including one file for each letter of the English alphabet (A-Z), and the numbers zero through nine.

12. **(Original)** The method of Claim 6 wherein the sorting step includes sorting each of the plurality of separate files based on an ASCII value of characters stored in the plurality of separate files.

13. **(Original)** The method of Claim 1 wherein the step of creating a plurality of first index files includes:

(a) selecting a keyword from the refined list of keywords;
(b) determining whether the selected keyword comprises multiple words, and if so,

(c) selecting a word with the greatest number of individual characters from the multiple words comprising the selected keyword,

(d) opening a one of a plurality of sorted separate files based on a first character of the selected word from the selected keyword, wherein the plurality of sorted separate file were created by indexing a plurality of domain name files associated with a domain name system for the refined list of keywords, and

(e) searching the open sorted separate file for the selected word from

the selected keyword,

(f) repeating steps (c) through (e) for remaining words in the selected keyword;

and if not,

(g) opening a one of a plurality of sorted separate files based on a first character of the selected keyword, wherein the plurality of sorted separate file were created by indexing a plurality of domain name files associated with a domain name system for the refined list of keywords, and

(h) searching the open sorted separate file for the selected keyword;

(i) determining whether the selected keyword has been found in the open separate sorted, file, and if so,

(j) adding an entry to a first index file for the selected keyword;

(k) repeating steps (a), (b) and (i) for remaining keywords from the refined list of keywords.

14.-22 (Canceled).

23. (Original) A vertical search engine system, comprising in combination:

a vertical search engine server with associated database for indexing and searching a plurality of top-level domain name files associated with a domain name system for a computer network for a selected list of keywords for a selected topic, for indexing and searching electronic content from a plurality of web-sites identified by a plurality of domain names from the plurality of top-level domain name files and for creating a vortal index from the indexed plurality of top-level domain name files and the electronic content from the plurality of web-sites; and

a protocol stack on the vertical search engine server for communicating with other network devices on the computer network; and

a server network device for making a vortal accessible on a network device via the computer network for a selected subject using the vertical index created by the vertical search engine server.

24. **(Original)** The vertical search engine system of Claim 23 top-level domain name files associated with a domain name system including opening a .COM, .EDU, .GOV, .MIL, .NET or .ORG top-level domain name file associated with the Internet Domain Name system.

25. **(Original)** The vertical search engine system of Claim 23 wherein the domain name system for the computer network includes the Domain Name System for the Internet.

26. **(Original)** A method for creating a vertical search engine, comprising:
receiving a list of a plurality of keywords to be used for the vertical search engine on a network device, wherein the list of keywords includes general and specific keywords for a selected subject;

processing the list of plurality of keywords to create a refined list of keywords, wherein the processing includes adding, subtracting or modifying automatically the list of plurality of keywords;

creating a plurality of first index files associated with a plurality of first data files by checking a plurality of domain names from a plurality of domain name files

associated with a domain name system for a computer network, wherein the plurality of first index files include a plurality of pointers to the associated data files, and wherein the plurality of first data files include a plurality of entries including electronic information extracted from a plurality of web-sites associated with a plurality of active domain names from the plurality of domain name files, wherein the step of creating the plurality of first index files includes:

opening a plurality of top-level domain name files associated with the domain name system for the computer network;

checking a plurality of domain names from the plurality of open top-level domain name files to determine whether any of the plurality of domain names are associated with an active web-site on the computer network;

extracting domain names in the plurality of open top-level domain name files associated with active web-sites on the computer network;

storing the extracted domains names in a plurality of entries in a plurality of separate files, thereby creating a plurality of separate files including the plurality of entries; and

sorting each of the plurality of separate files based on a pre-determined sorting scheme to create a plurality of sorted separate files;

creating a plurality of second index files with associated plurality of second data files by searching the plurality of first index files for keywords from the refined list of keywords, wherein the plurality of second index files include a plurality of pointers to the associated plurality of second data files, and wherein the plurality of second data files include a plurality of entries including electronic information extracted from a plurality of web-sites associated with the plurality of active domain

names for keywords from the refined list of keywords;

verifying that entries in the plurality of second index files are appropriate for the selected subject;

creating a final index from the plurality of entries first index; and

making a vortal accessible on another network device via the computer network for the selected subject using the final index.

27. (Original) A method for creating a vertical search engine, comprising:

receiving a list of a plurality of keywords to be used for the vertical search engine on a network device, wherein the list of keywords includes general and specific keywords for a selected subject;

processing the list of plurality of keywords to create a refined list of keywords, wherein the processing includes adding, subtracting or modifying automatically the list of plurality of keywords;

creating a plurality of first index files associated with a plurality of first data files by checking a plurality of domain names from a plurality of domain name files associated with a domain name system for a computer network, wherein the plurality of first index files include a plurality of pointers to the associated data files, and wherein the plurality of first data files include a plurality of entries including electronic information extracted from a plurality of web-sites associated with a plurality of active domain names from the plurality of domain name files, wherein the step of creating a plurality of first index files includes:

(a) selecting a keyword from the refined list of keywords;

(b) determining whether the selected keyword comprises multiple words, and

if so,

(c) selecting a word with the greatest number of individual characters from the multiple words comprising the selected keyword,

(d) opening a one of a plurality of sorted separate files based on a first character of the selected word from the selected keyword, wherein the plurality of sorted separate file were created by indexing a plurality of domain name files associated with a domain name system for the refined list of keywords, and

(e) searching the open sorted separate file for the selected word from the selected keyword,

(f) repeating steps (c) through (e) for remaining words in the selected keyword;

and if not,

(g) opening a one of a plurality of sorted separate files based on a first character of the selected keyword, wherein the plurality of sorted separate file were created by indexing a plurality of domain name files associated with a domain name system for the refined list of keywords, and

(h) searching the open sorted separate file for the selected keyword;

(i) determining whether the selected keyword has been found in the open separate sorted, file, and if so,

(j) adding an entry to a first index file for the selected keyword;

(k) repeating steps (a), (b) and (i) for remaining keywords from the refined list of keywords;

creating a plurality of second index files with associated plurality of second data files by searching the plurality of first index files for keywords from the refined

list of keywords, wherein the plurality of second index files include a plurality of pointers to the associated plurality of second data files, and wherein the plurality of second data files include a plurality of entries including electronic information extracted from a plurality of web-sites associated with the plurality of active domain names for keywords from the refined list of keywords;

verifying that entries in the plurality of second index files are appropriate for the selected subject;

creating a final index from the plurality of entries first index; and

making a vortal accessible on another network device via the computer network for the selected subject using the final index.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.